

## Guidelines for Reviewers

Thank you for reviewing for BS2027. The quality of the scientific programme depends on careful, fair, and timely reviews. This guide explains how to review and what we ask of you.

### Review at a glance

|                        |                                                                |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Abstract review        | Assignments after 15 August 2026, decisions by 25 October 2026 |
| Full paper review      | Assignments after 15 January 2027, decisions by 22 March 2027  |
| Reviews per submission | At least two independent reviews                               |
| Process                | Double-blind, completed in ConfTool                            |

### How the review works

Review is **double-blind** and runs in two stages: abstracts, then full papers. After each deadline, submissions are assigned through ConfTool, matched to the themes and expertise you selected, and the Scientific Track Chairs decide based on the reviews. When you accept your assignments, please indicate your **familiarity with the topic** so that reviews can be balanced. Throughout, apply the same standards across topics and authors, and write feedback that helps authors improve, whatever your recommendation.

### How to score

Score each submission in ConfTool against five criteria:

- **Alignment with the theme:** how well the work fits the conference theme and the chosen track.
- **Structure of the abstract:** whether it is clear and well organised and conveys the objective, method, and expected results.
- **Originality:** what is new in the approach, method, or findings.
- **Significance and impact of the work:** the importance of the contribution and its value to research or practice.
- **Overall recommendation:** your summary judgement, reflecting the extent of revision needed before the work can be published.

At the full paper stage, you assess the same qualities in the completed paper, including the soundness of the methods and results. Look for papers that are well structured and clear, and that **show results rather than intentions**. Please elaborate on your recommendation in the comments, referring to specific sections where it helps: comment on academic writing standards (form, content, scientific notation) and language quality (typos, wording), and recommend proofreading where the English needs it. If you wish, you may upload an anonymised, corrected PDF to help the authors.

### Research papers and practice papers

The two paper types are judged differently:

- **Research papers:** assessed on originality, rigour, and significance in the usual way.
- **Practice papers:** report applied work, case studies, and lessons from practice, and should **not** be judged as advanced research.

A practice paper need not break new scientific ground to be valuable. Assess it on the relevance and clarity of the application, the soundness of the work, and the usefulness and transferability of its lessons, holding it to high standards of clarity rather than novelty.

### Confidentiality and ethics

The submissions you evaluate are the **unpublished work of other authors**. Keep their contents confidential, in whole or in part, until publication.

- Because review is double-blind, do not try to identify the authors, and keep your comments free of anything that reveals your identity.
- Decline any submission where you have a conflict of interest.
- Raise any suspected plagiarism or misconduct with the Scientific Track Chairs, not in your comments to the authors.

### If you cannot review in time

Please tell us as soon as possible if you cannot review an assigned submission in time, so we can reassign it and keep the process on schedule.

### Questions

For questions about your assignments or the review process, please contact *[reviewer contact email, to be confirmed]*.